



**City of Seattle  
Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**



**UNIVERSITY OF  
WASHINGTON**  
OFFICE OF REGIONAL AFFAIRS

**Members**

**Matthew Fox (Co Chair)**  
*University District Community Council*

**David Gee**  
*Eastlake Community Council*

**Jan Arntz**  
*University of Washington Staff*

**Alex Bolton**  
*University of Washington At-Large*

**Kirsten Curry**  
*Laurelhurst Community club*

**Dave Eckert**  
*Roosevelt Neighbor's Alliance*

**Ashley Emery**  
*University of Washington Faculty*

**Brett Frosaker**  
*Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc*

**Daniel Nguyen**  
*University of Washington Students*

**Lionel Job**  
*Montlake Community club*

**Eric Larson**  
*Roosevelt Neighbor's Alliance*

**Douglas Campbell**  
*Greater University District Chamber of commerce*

**Mark Christiansen**  
*Wallingford Community council*

**Barbara Quinn**  
*University Park Community Club*

**Betty Swift**  
*Portage Bay/Roanoke Community council*

**Alternates**

**Jorgen Bader**  
*University District Community Council*

**Kerry Kahl**  
*University of Washington Staff*

**Ray Larson**  
*University of Washington At-Large*

**Chris Leman**  
*Eastlake Community Council*

**Heather Newman**  
*Laurelhurst Community Club*

**Tom Roth**  
*Ravenna Springs Community Council*

**Ruedi Risler**  
*University Park Community Council*

**Sharon Scully**  
*University District Community Council*

**Larry Sinnott**  
*Ravenna Bryant Community Association*

**Matthew Stubbs**  
*University of Washington*

**Ex-Officio Members**

**Steve Sheppard – DON**  
*City of Seattle, Dept. of Neighborhoods*

**Theresa Doherty – UW**  
*University of Washington, Office of Regional Affairs*

# City of Seattle - University of Washington Community Advisory Committee

## Meeting Notes

### Meeting # 135

**September 9, 2014**

UW Tower

4333 Brooklyn Avenue

Seattle, WA 98105

22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

## Members and Alternates Present

Matt Fox

Barbara Quinn

Jan Arntz

Jean Amick

David Gee

Douglas Campbell

Chris Leman

## Staff and Others Present

Steve Sheppard

Kristine Kenney

Josh Kavanaugh

Dave Anderson

Theresa Doherty

Rebecca Barnes

Eric Smith

## I. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was opened by Matt Fox.

## II. Housekeeping – Approval of Agenda

The meeting agenda was approved without substantive changes.

## III. North Campus Housing Project Facility

Rebecca Barnes was recognized to discuss this issue. Ms. Barnes stated that the Phase IV of the Housing Master Plan involves looking at the last four of the student housing buildings on campus. These are all on the east campus area. There Include Haggett, McMahon, McCarty and Hansee Halls. Three of the four (Haggett, McMahon, McCarty) are some of the more contemporary looking residence halls but have been determined to require serious code upgrades. Hansee is a campus gothic building and will be left as is.

The City of Seattle-University of Washington Community Advisory Committee advises both on the community impact of planning and development activities at the University of Washington and surrounding area. For more information on CUCAC activities call either: Steve Sheppard – City of Seattle (206) 684-0302 or Theresa Doherty – University of Washington (206) 221-2603.

Bernie Agor Matsuno, Interim Director  
700 5th Avenue  
PO Box 94649  
Seattle, WA 98124-4649



Tel (206) 684-0464  
Fax (206) 233-5142  
[www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods](http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods)



It has been determined that Hagget and McCarty should be demolished and replaced. The re-development would achieve an increase of a couple hundred of beds above that already achieved through the West Campus student housing projects. Most of the increase in beds has been accomplished in the West Campus, but there is a need to add more beds in the North Campus. It was determined that at a minimum Hagett and McCarty will be demolished and replaced. McMahon will likely be repurposed to other uses.

Consultants have been hired to look at how the area will be redesigned. One of the areas being reviewed is Denny Field and its adjoining tennis courts. The field is heavily used by students. One of the options being seriously considered would use of the tennis courts for building site and renovate of Denny Field. Denny Field would actually become a bit larger. Two or three additional open space in conjunction with the new dormitories to serve the students would also be added to the area. The use of the adjacent tennis courts will require that the Campus Master Plan be amended.

Theresa Doherty noted that the Denny Field and associated tennis court site was not identified as a development site in the current Campus Master Plan. Because of this the University will have to request an amendment to its plan to accommodate this action. The University will bring this formally to CUCAC at its October meeting and request a minor amendment to the Campus Master Plan around Denny Field to create the desired new development site

#### **IV. Burke Gilman Trail Update**

Mr. Josh Kavanaugh was introduced to discuss the status of the Burke Gilman Trail project. Mr. Kavanaugh stated that this remains a high priority for the University. The trail is failing according to SDOT standards. This portion of the trail is heavily used, congested, and is clearly beginning to show its degradation. There has been a 92% increase in pedestrian volume and a projected 238% increase in cycle volume by 2030. These projected increases in use alone combined with safety concerns make this a very critical project. The University owns the 1.7 miles of the trail within its campus and, has sole physical and financial responsibility for of the section of the trail.

Mr. Kavanaugh then presented a new photo illustration of the trail and described the strategy around reforestation around the trail that was discussed in the April meeting of last year, but the comments were not added in the minutes. The University is committed to an aggressive landscaping project and University policy requires a 1:1 replacement of all trees removed for construction. In order to restore the corridor and canopy restoration as quickly as possible, the plan is to pursue a more aggressive strategy that is denser than the 1:1 policy. Using the 1:1 formula, Phase I of the project would result in 86 trees being removed and replaced and Phase II 265 trees being replaced and removed.

He noted that the section along the hillside west of Montlake with its significant grades will be most disrupted during construction. This area must be widened to address the safety and capacity issue. In order to address these issues the engineers have determined that a 60 ft. wide will be needed in this area. The challenge will be to address the capacity issue while preserving the recreation and urban oasis character of the trail. He noted that this is a major commuter corridor used by some very serious commuters (the spandex warriors) One goal will be tame the behavior of the spandex warriors and somehow reduce their speeds. Efficiently accommodating volumes rather than f speed is the goal. Currently, about 50% of

traffic on the trail is unaffiliated with the University and pure public and neighborhood use is greater than 50%.

There was considerable discussion of landscaping and tree restoration. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that there are ongoing conversations with the landscape architects using a mix of trees along the trail. This is a sensitive issue and the University has deliberately chosen ornamentals and natives that grow at their own pace. The University tasked the landscape designers to strongly consider trees to establish themselves quickly and rapidly. Still there will be a period during re-establishment where it look more barren that at present. This is unavoidable. There will be establishing some neat things in the trail and barriers and was told or an understanding that there will be a significant reestablishment of the canopies.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated that all of the work was done on a “thread of a needle” concept that seeks to minimize the number of existing trees on the trail on the hillside that would be lost. Still some disruption is unavoidable; trees that are disruptive to the trail. In response to Committee Questions, Mr. Cavanaugh, that Mason Road that is parallel to the trail will be used as the alternative route during construction.

Mr. Sheppard asked Mr. Cavanaugh about the status of the Tiger Grant. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that unfortunately, the University learned just prior to the meeting that they will not be receiving the Tiger Grant for this project. He expressed great disappointment in this and stated that it will force the University to immediately reprogram funds from other sources for this project. He mentioned that they have not begun the recalibration but will do so in the near future. He stated that they will again reapply for the Tiger Grant, but stated that every round there will be a whole set of competitors.

Mr. Cavanaugh reiterated that this is a critical transportation project for the University and will still continue even without the Tiger Grant funding. The University is consulting with their regional partners to discuss contingencies especially in light of the relationship of this project to the new Sound Transit Station. The partners will discuss on how to mitigate impacts, and the University felt that these topics need discussions. There may be some opportunities for joint funding.

## **V. New Business**

Mr. Campbell reminded the Committee about the Open Space forum, scheduled for October 7<sup>th</sup> regarding the shape of the open space. There will also be free events scheduled on October 30<sup>th</sup>.

Members asked how this planning related to the previous parks element of the neighborhood plan. Mr. Fox stated that the parks plan was never specific. The neighborhood plan definitely identifies the need for open space but really didn't get specific as to locations

## **VII. Adjournment**

No further business being before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned